

REMARKS

Claims 20-22, 31-32, and 42 are amended. Claims 1-19, 23-30, 33-41 and 43-58 are canceled. Claims 59-64 are newly added. Claims 20-22, 31-32, 42, and 59-64 remain pending in this application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications

Claims 20-22, 24-26, 31-33, 42, and 47-58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,177,931 Alexander et al. (“Alexander”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,039,928 to Kamada et al. (“Kamada”), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,766,524 to Matheny et al. (“Matheny”), and still further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,185,355 to Ellis. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 20, as amended, incorporates the limitations of dependent claims 53, 56, 57, and 58, and newly recites, *inter alia*, “wherein the information supply terminal retrieves the media program category storage portion based on the media program associated with the information representing that the media program was watched by the individual person thereby to add a numerical value to a hit category of the individual information.” None of the relied upon references teach this limitation.

As shown in Figs. 3, 4, and 11 of the present application, and described in the specification, for example, at page 14, line 1, to page 15, line 8, and at page 19, line 11, to page 21 line 15, etc.: 1- the individual audience result information portion adds, to the individual audience result information, information (flag) representing that a media program was watched by the individual person; and 2- the information supply terminal retrieves the media program category storage portion based on the media program associated with the information representing that the media program was watched by the individual person thereby to add a numerical value to a hit category of the individual information.

Thus, the categories of programs watched by each individual audience are aggregated for each category and so obtained as individual interest information. The present invention provides a concrete method of obtaining such individual interest information, aggregated for each category.

Furthermore, according to the present invention, since the present invention can obtain the numerical value which is weighted in accordance with the time information representing a time or time period during which the media program was watched by the individual person, the individual interest information better matched to the watching state can be prepared for each individual person.

The Office Action appears to assert that the viewer profile of Alexander (col. 29, line 14) teaches the individual audience result information portion of the present invention. Alexander, however, does not teach or suggest that the viewer profile information has the information of a flag or the time information as recited in claim 20.

In addition, the Office Action appears to assert that the profile program of Alexander (col. 29, line 20) corresponds to the individual interest information portion of the present invention. Alexander, however, does not teach or suggest the unique feature of the present invention of adding the numerical value corresponding to the time during which the media program was watched by the individual person. As Kamada, Matheny, and Ellis fail to cure these deficiencies, claim 20 should be found to be allowable over the cited references.


Claims 21, 22, 31, 32, and 42 have been amended to recite similar limitations and should be found to be allowable over the references for at least the reasons provided above, as well as on their own merits. All other remaining rejected claims have been canceled, so their rejection is moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

New claims 59-64 depend from claims 20, 21, 22, 31, 32, and 42 and are patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above, and on their own merits. Furthermore, the cited references fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the additional limitations.

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: May 15, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Mark J. Thronson

Registration No.: 33,082
Anthony M. Briggs, Jr.
Registration No.: 52,654
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1825 Eye Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-5403
(202) 420-2200
Attorneys for Applicant